DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 172 124 CG 013 567

AUTHOR Wood, Marion M.; Greenfeld, Susan T.
TITLE Meaning of Success; A Comparison of Attitudes Among Women in Male-Dominated and Female-Dominated Occupations.
PUB DATE 28 Aug 78
NOTE 38p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (Toronto, Ontario, Canada, August, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Careers; *Fear of Success; *Job Satisfaction; Life Style; *Nontraditional Occupations; *Occupational Aspiration; Research Projects; Sex Role; Success Factors; *Work Attitudes; *Working Women

ABSTRACT

Since the reemergence of the women's movement in the early 1970's, it has been necessary to reexamine women's definitions of success and attitudes toward work across a spectrum of traditional and non-traditional jobs. Three basic hypotheses were tested: women in female-dominated jobs (1) have higher fear of success imagery and (2) attach more importance to socioexpressive factors of success, but (3) place less emphasis on instrumental task factors of success than do women in male-dominated jobs. Data were gathered through a Profile Questionnaire and a projective test. Significant differences were found only in emphasis on instrumental task factors of success. Women in male-dominated jobs indicated a higher need to define success as "recognition from others on the job," "becoming an authority," "achieveing a high salary," and "obtaining a title of responsibility." (Author/LS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED172124

Meaning of Success

A comparison of attitudes among women in male-dominated and female-dominated occupations

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Marion M. Wood

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND THE ERIC SYSTEM CONTRACTORS."

Marion M. Wood

University of Southern California

Susan T. Greenfeld

Texas A & M University

Running head: Meaning of Success

CG013567

This reports partial findings of S.T. Greenfeld's doctorial research for her dissertation, "Attitudes Toward Work and Success of Women Employed in Male- Vs. Female-Dominated Jobs," March 1978. It was prepared for presentation at the 86th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association in Toronto, Canada, August 28 - September 1, 1978.

CN001442

Meaning of Success

A comparison of attitudes among women in male-dominated and female dominated occupations.

The past decade has witnessed a surge of research on women and fear of success (Horner, 1968; 1970), but none of the 200 or more studies undertaken so far has clearly defined "success", a fundamental concept of the controversial fear-of-success (FOS) hypothesis (cf. Tresemer, 1976; 1977). It's quite conceivable, however, that an important factor contributing to the difficulties encountered in replicating Horner's research is the way individual subjects who have participated in these studies view "success."

The study reported here explored women's definitions of success and attitudes toward work across a spectrum of traditional and non-traditional jobs. Participating in the research were 324 women representing three occupational categories: 155 in male-dominated jobs; 62 in relatively balanced jobs; and 107 in female-dominated jobs.[1] Approximately 17 percent were clerical workers, and 24 percent managers. Half the women were in a professional related field (Table 1).

Vicarious Success Mode

Simply defined, success is related to achievement of goals, and goals vary widely among human beings. Great wealth may be a common goal for some, but just as many may feel success is the achievement of an educational degree, top ranking in a sport, marrying an important person, or raising high achieving children.

Because success values, like roles, have been sex-related in our society, areas in which one can "do well" and achieve goals have also been stereotyped as male or female domains. For example, Ginzberg (1966) wrote that a man achieves his status almost exclusively through his work and a married woman attains her status largely through her husband. As long as seventy years ago the same expectation was commonly held. Van Dykke (1908, cited in Mizruchi, 1964, p. 64) observed:

> Everyone knows that success with the great masses spells money... it is money that the new generation expects to win and it is money that the parents want them to win. The boy will make it, and the girl, if she is not a goose, will marry it. They will get it one way or the other.

Until the reemergence of the women's movement in the early 1970's, a women's success was linked to a significant male in her life, generally her father or husband. Class status was based on the education and occupation of the husband. Investigating ambition of young people, Turner (1964) studied 1352 boys and 1441 girls from ten different high school senior classes in Los Angeles. His index for male ambition included three factors: expected occupation in 20 years, desire for material wealth (cars and houses), and their expected educational attainment. His index for female ambition included only two factors: the minimum occupation they would expect their husbands to occupy in 20 years and their material expectation. Education was excluded. Findings led Turner to conclude "the husband's occupation is the key status for most women in American society" (p. 38, 98). The assumption that women choose

a vicarious success mode was supported in a study early in the 1970's. In a survey of 3,500 women, Rossi (1972) asked the question, "Which kind of success you like for yourself?" The two most frequent responses were, "the mother of several highly accomplished children" and "the wife whose husband becomes very important."

Role Conflict About Success

Horner (1968; 1972) was the first to address, through empirical research, the dilemma faced by professionally ambitious women who are frustrated with the limits placed on their achievements by culturally imposed goals (e.g., good marriage, good mother, leader in community affairs, exceptional teaching skills). On the basis of findings from her 1964 study of college men and women, Horner postulated that women fear success in nontraditional fields because they anticipate negative consequences in the form of social rejection or loss of femininity. She defined "fear-of-success" as neither the will nor the need to fail, but rather the feelings of anxiety or ambivalence aroused by this dilemma about "success" (Horner, 1972).

Role conflicts for women were also addressed in classical small group theory (Parson and Bales, 1955) which contends women have been assigned to socioexpressive roles. Specifically, mothers and daughters are viewed as expressive role players; they give support, resolve disputes, and provide basic emotional stability within the family. On the other hand, this theory proposes, fathers

and sons held instrumental roles; they are task-oriented, leaders of the hunt, judgers and executors of punishment (p. 318). Thus, culturally defined stereotypes dichotomize professional success and femininity for women.

This distinction remained a dominant theme of the literature through the 1960's. Women were seen as preferring jobs allowing for service or fulfillment and for having a strong need for affiliation (McClelland, 1965; Clark and Exposito, 1971). Simpson (1969) proposed that women's values and goals make many of them "tractable subordinates... they tend to want friendly relations with co-workers and are often afraid to risk these for the sake of autonomy and power" (p. 231). Wagman's 1965 survey of occupational interests indicated that female high school seniors and college sophomores place a higher value on a "job where you could help other people" than do males (Bartol, 1973, p. 18). In another study (Centers, 1966), women were found to place a higher value than men on "good co-workers", and men placed a relatively higher value on the opportunity to use their talent or skills (p. 193).

Even into the 1970's, studies were indicating a difference in success values between men and women. Almquist and Angrist (1974) found that college women who chose typically women's occupations were more interested in the people-oriented features of their future occupations than were the college senior women who chose atypical occupations for women (p. 246).

When the authors conducted a field study to assess fear-of-success in high-achieving male and female managers, they found

indications of changing attitudes about success among both the men and women (Wood and Greenfeld, 1976; 1978). Both sexes, not just the men, tended to see money and status as success values. They differed only in the women were as much motivated by self-fulfillment in manager's careers as they were in salary and recognition. Men were more inclined to emphasize the material rewards.

The present study was designed to gain better understanding of these changing attitudes of women by comparing those who have chosen nontraditional occupations with those who are following traditional career paths.

METHOD

Study Design

A total of 324 women, representing 13 organizations, responded to a Profile Questionnaire which elicited personal background data, attitudes toward work and success, and information regarding job title, promotions, and salary. In addition, a subsample of 102 women from eight companies participated in a modified Thematic Apperception Test (TAT), designed to arouse imagery of success in management.

Three hypotheses were tested:

Hypothesis 1: Women in female dominated jobs have higher "fear of success" imagery than do women in male dominated jobs;

Hypothesis 2: Women in female-dominated jobs attach more importance to socioexpressive factors of success than do women in male dominated jobs;

Hypothesis 3: Women in male dominated jobs place more emphasis on instrumental task factors of success than do women in male dominated jobs.

Subjects

In the initial stage of data gathering, attempts were made to use blue collar women as the primary source of subjects. When it became clear that technically oriented companies were more willing to participate in the research, this job classification became the basis for study. Three criteria for selection were provided cooperating companies: subjects must be volunteers and should have been working for the company for at least one year; one half the subject sample should be working in a female-dominated job and the other half in a male-dominated job; and an approximately equal number should be considered fast or slow movers in terms of promotions and pay increases. Although not all specifications were adhered to by all participating companies, they finally selected subject sample came very close to these constraints.[2]

This subject sample represented a better educated, better paid group of working women than the United States women workforce as a whole. The proportion of minorities was comparable to the nation, overall, but black women were slightly underrepresented (Table 1). The median age, 35, matched the median for the nation's female labor population. The range for this study was 18 to 63. Married women comprised the same proportion as that for the nation, but widows were underrepresented, with divorced and seperated women

Table 1

Frequency distribution of subjects in comparison to U.S. female working population

	1975 U.S. Female Working Population	Subjects		1974 U.S.	Subjects
Marital Status					
Single	23.2%	27.2%			
Married	57.8	43.9	Median earnings (all women)	$6,772	16,624
Divorced or separated	12.3	28.0			
Widowed	6.7	0.9	Median (professional)	9,587	-
	100.0%	100.0%			
Ethnic background			Median schooling	12.5 years	some college
Black	11.0%	7.1%			
Mexican, American	4.0	6.2			
Oriental	1.0	5.0			
other minority	1.0	1.0			
Caucasian	83.0	80.7			
	100.0%	100.0%			
Occupations					
Clerical	35.0%	17.0%			
Service workers	18.0	0.0			
Professional & technical	16.0	50.0			
Operatives	12.0	8.0			
Sales workers	7.0	1.0			
Managers	5.0	24.0			
Private household	3.0	0.0			
Other	4.0	0.0			
	100.0%	100.0%			

overrepresented. In salary, women participating in this study had far higher annual earnings than the estimated mean for women in the United States. One out of two in the sample reported earning more than $15,000 and two percent, more than $30,000. In 1975, only two percent of all women over 18 (including homemakers) in the United States made over $14,000 in individual income (NCOIWY, p. 16).

Profile Questionnaire

Three separate areas were addressed in the questionnaire: personal factors, including marital status, number of children, number of siblings, and family educational and occupational status; historical and current aspects of job, including salary, position, title, number of promotions, past positions, and 16 questions on feelings toward current job; and, finally, feelings about being successful. The questionnaire was completed by 324 women, with 102 answering it in conjunction with the projective test and 222 responding to a mail survey within their companies.

The 16 questions about work feelings ranged from "is your work important?" to "have you had pressures from others on the job?" The subject responded on a seven-point scale, from "very great extent" to "not at all". To elicit attitudes toward feeling successful, the subject was asked to rate 12 definitions of success on a 5-point scale from "not important" to "essential." The definitions, all abstracted from the literature, were classified as representing either a socioexpressive value or an instrumental task value. Socioexpressive values were identified as more instru-

mental task success values were identified as more important to women in male-dominated jobs. A third value, vicarious success mode, was also identified for women in female-dominated job.

Definitions of Success

Five of the definitions of success were adapted from a study concerned with homemaking and career orientation of college women (Rand, 1968). The subject sample contained 858 women.

> "Becoming an authority in your particular occupation." (Instrumental task)
>
> "Obtaining recognition from others in your job." (Instrumental task)
>
> "Obtaining awards outside the organization." (Instrumental task)
>
> "Obtaining recognition from friends or others outside of work." (Instrumental task)
>
> "Being well liked." (Socioexpressive)

Three definitions summarized findings by Barwick (1972) and Lozoff (1974):

> "Contribute to the welfare of friend and personal acquaintances." (Socioexpressive)
>
> "Develop strong relationships with others on the job." (Socioexpressive)
>
> 'Supervising volunteer organizations or community projects." (Socioexpressive)

An eighth definition was suggested in a study measuring success for men (Nehrbass, 1975):

> "Achieving a very high salary." (Instrumental task)

Another instrumental-task definition was abstracted from

Livingston's study of the characteristics differentiating successful from less successful women in radio and TV (Aronson, p. 230):

> "Having a title and job description indicating high responsibility." (Instrumental task)

One of the two definitions implying a vicarious achievement mode was modified from Ginzberg's (1974) work:

> "Marrying a person who has money or position." (Vicarious success)

The other implication of vacarious success identified home ownership as a major sign of success (Mizruichi, 1964):

> "Acquiring a large home or expensive piece of real estate." (Vicarious success)

A final, open-ended question allowed the respondent to include her own definition(s) of success.

Projective Instrument

The 102 women who participated in the modified Thematic Apperception Test represented eight different organizations. In group sessions of 3 to 16 each, they were told the purpose of the study was to investigate women's attitudes toward careers across various industries. After the test packets were distributed, instructions were read and the group was given 30 seconds to read the first verbal cue (neutral), six minutes to write stories within the framework of the four TAT questions, then allowed to complete the multiple choice questions about the neutral cue figure at their own pace. The same procedure followed for the test cue(s). As a final task, the subjects completed the Profile Questionnaire.

Both test cues of the Projective Instrument were adapted from early work by Horner (1972), Spence (1974) and Wood and Greenfeld

(1976). Half the respondents wrote stories to the cue relating to a male-dominated job category and half to a female-dominated job category. Specifically, the modified TAT was used to assess fear of success imagery regarding the hypothetical promotion of a woman in a managerial position. The story cue adapted to a female-dominated job read:

> "Janet's boss has been permanently transferred to another division of the company in which Janet works. Janet has been chosen above many other private secretaries to assume her boss's position as Manager of Secretarial Services."

The story cue adapted to a male-dominated job read:

> "Janet's boss has been permanently transferred to another division of the company in which Janet works. Janet has been chosen above many other electricians to assume her boss's position as Manager of Technical Services."

Hypotheses were tested by contingency table analyses. In addition, partial correlation and multiple regression analyses were used to indicate variables explaining the most variance among the three groups of women.

Hypothesis 1

Subjects' written stories in response to the success oriented cue about Janet in the modified TAT instrument provided the data for assessing "fear-of-success" imagery. All stories were read independently by a rater from the Psychology Department of U.S.C. who was trained in scoring the FOS construct but was unfamiliar with the research design or the sample population. Spence's (1974) modification of Horner's scoring system was followed.

Stories with positive imagery were coded (0) as low fear of success; (1) for high fear of success. Stories with negative imagery were so few they were recoded (1) and aggregated with the stories of mixed imagery.

Two different versions of the success-oriented cue were used. Women responding to the female-dominated cue (manager of secretarial services) were coded (0) while women responding to the male-dominated cue (manager of technical services) were coded (1).

Hypothesis 2

Four of the 12 definitions of success included in the Profile Questionnaire were identified as socioexpressive: 1) contribute to the welfare of friends and personal acquaintances; 2) being well-liked; 3) supervising volunteer organizations or community projects; and 4) developing strong relationships with others on your job. Each of these four was dichotomized according to the median response.

Subjects who stated "contributing to the welfare of friends and personal acquaintances" or "being well-liked" was "very important" or "essential" were recoded (0) while all others were recoded (1). Those who ranked "supervising volunteer organizations or community projects" as "somewhat important", "important", "very important", or "essential" in the scale of choices were recoded (0) while all others were recoded (1). Those who ranked "developing strong relationships with others on the job" as "important" through "essential" were recoded (0) while all others were recoded (1).

Each socioexpressive success value was analyzed separately, then as a composite (FVALUE). Recoded socioexpressive success values were added and dichotomized. Those women with high socioexpressive orientation (i.e., scores 0 or 1) were recoded 0, while those with low socioexpressive orientation (i.e., scores of 2, 3, or 4) were recoded as (1).

Two of the twelve definitions were defined as vicarious success mode: 1) marrying a person who has money or position and 2) acquiring a large home or expensive piece of real estate.

Subjects who ranked either of these definitions as "somewhat important" to "essential" were recoded as (0) while those subjects choosing both definitions of success as "not at all" important were recoded as (1). Recoded vicarious success definitions were added and dichotomized and used as a composite (RVALUE).

Hypothesis 3

Six of the 12 definitions of success in the Profile Questionnaire were identified as instrumental task: 1) becoming an authority in your particular occupation; 2) obtaining recognition from others in your job; 3) having a title and job description indicating responsibility; 4) achieving a very high salary; 5) obtaining special awards outside of work; and 6) obtaining recognition from friends or others outside of work. Each of these was dichotomized by the median response.

Subjects who ranked "obtaining recognition from others in your job," "becoming an authority in your occupation" and "achieving a very high salary" as "not important," "somewhat important," or "important," or "important" on the scale were recoded as (0).

Those stating these definitions as "very important", or "essential" were recoded as (1).

Subjects who ranked "having a title and job description indicating high responsibility" and "obtaining recognition from friends or others outside of work" as "not important" or "somewhat important" were recoded (0) while those stating these items were "important", "very important" or "essential" were recoded as (1).

Finally, subjects who stated "obtaining special awards outside the organization" was "not important" were recoded (0) while all others were recoded as (1).

Each instrumental task success value was analyzed separately, then used as part of the composite (MVALUE). Recoded instrumental task success values were added and dichotomized. Those women with low instrumental task orientation (i.e., scores 0 through 3) were recoded (0) while women with high instrumental task orientation (i.e., scores of 4 or more) were recoded (1).

Through this coding process, then, the three hypotheses were subjected to individual contingency table tests and, where appropriate, each was also tested by a composite index. Major reclassified variables were run against every other major variable using cross tabulations via the SPSS on an IBM 370. Outputs thus were obtained in terms of phi or Cramer's V for the chi squares tests. In addition, partial correlations controlling for age and education were performed on the major variables listed in the hypotheses. Specifically, partial correlations were run on the background factors as one group, the success values as one group and work attitudes as a third group. Finally, multiple regression equations

as a predictor of sex dominance of the job category was tested using the second half of the sample.

RESULTS

Fear-of-Success

Findings did not support the contention that women in female dominated jobs are more apprehensive about succeeding in a managerial position. In fact, this group manifested the least negative imagery (Horner's measure of "fear of success") especially when responding to the male-dominated success cue situation. Approximately 40 percent of the women in male dominated jobs and relatively balanced jobs projected this type of imagery as compared to only 25 percent of the women in female-dominated jobs. These percentages are lower than Horner's (1972) findings of fear of success imagery in 68 percent of the college women she studied.

Results indicated women in female dominated jobs are more positive about the promotion of a women into a managerial position than are women in either male dominated or relatively balanced jobs. However, sample size precludes this tendency from reaching significance. When analyzed by the cue responded to, women in female-dominated jobs responded significantly more positively to the promotion of a woman into a technical managerial position than did women in either male dominated or relatively balanced jobs ($p < .05$). No differences were indicated among groups when the main character of the cue is promoted into a position where she manages secretaries (Table 2).

Table 2

Tests of Hypothesis 1

Variable[1]	M-dom	R-bal	F-dom	Chi square	V	Significance
	(n=53)	(n=21)	(n=28)			
Overall						
%negative or mixed imagery	41.5%	42.9%	25.0%	2.160	.147	N.S.
By Test						
Manager of Secretarial Services	(n=26)	(n=7)	(n=16)			
% negative or mixed	46.2%	42.9%	43.8%	.037	.027	N.S.
By Test						
Manager of Technical Services	(n=27)	(n=14)	(n=12)			
% negative or mixed imagery	37.0%	42.9%	0.0%	6.856	.360	.01<p<.05

[1] df = 2

Definition of Success

This research did not support the notion that women in female-dominated jobs attach more importance to socioexpressive factors of success than do women in male-dominated jobs. However, findings indicated women in male-dominated jobs feel a higher need to define success in an instrumental-task sense.

Overall, the three groups of women ranked the twelve definitions of success similarily, but the intensity factor of responses for women in male-dominated jobs caused four of the definitions to be significant factors in every statistical test used: 1) recognition from others on the job; 2) becoming an authority; 3) achieving a very high salary; and 4) obtaining a title of responsibility. "Being well-liked", the first choice of women in female-dominated jobs, ranked fourth for women in male-dominated jobs, but seventh by women in female-dominated jobs. Women in male-dominated jobs indicated salary is important and were also the most likely to pursue better paying jobs (See Table 3).

Findings held when controlling for age and education (Table 4 & 5). College educated women tended to rate "achieving a very high salary" and "recognition" as important, but noncollege educated women in male-dominated jobs also rated these factors as important. Male-dominated jobs were found to attract women who want prestige and responsibility. Older women in female-dominated jobs appeared to be the least concerned with any definitions of success; younger women and women in male-dominated jobs were indicated as more success-oriented.

Table 3
Tests of Hypothesis 2

Variable[1]	M-dom	R-bal	F-dom	Chi square	V	Significance
Obtaining recognition % very important or essential	68.0%	49.2%	41.3%	19.072	.248	p<.001
Being an authority in the occupation %very important or essential	65.8%	54.1%	46.7%	9.693	.174	.001<p<.01
Achieving a very high salary % very important or essential	39.2%	31.7%	23.8%	6.751	.145	.01<p<.05
Having a title indicating responsibility % Important, very important or essential	61.9%	56.7%	44.2%	7.955	.158	.01<p<.05
Obtaining recognition from friends outside of work % Important, very important or essential	63.9%	62.3%	58.1%	.895	.053	N.S.
Obtaining special awards outside the organization % Somewhat important, Important, very important or essential	52.9%	41.0%	41.3%	4.390	.117	N.S.
Composite (M-value)[2]	53.0%	39.0%	27.5%	16.558	.230	p<.001

[1] df = 2; [2] df = 2

Table 4
Partial Correlation of sex dominance
with various attitudes toward working holding age and
education constant

Variable	Expected Correlation	Zero Order (n=298)	Controlling Age (n=297)	Controlling Education (n=297)	Controlling Age & Education (n=296)
Contributing to the welfare of others	M-dom	.023	.018	.022	.012
Becoming an authority in the occupation	M-dom	.150[c]	.151[c]	.149[c]	.146[c]
Marrying a person with a position or money	F-dom	-.030	-.041	-.028	-.048
Acquiring a large home or expensive piece of real estate	F-dom	-.066	-.076[a]	-.057	-.075
Obtaining recognition from others on the job	M-dom	.231[c]	.239[c]	.196[c]	.204
Obtaining a job title indicating responsibility	M-dom	.167[c]	.172[c]	.130[b]	.137[c]
Being well-liked	F-dom	.096[b]	.086[a]	.088[a]	.065
Achieving a very high salary	M-dom	.166[c]	.179[c]	.145[c]	.166[c]
Supervising volunteer organizations	F-dom	.002	-.006	.015	-.000
Obtaining special awards outside the organization	M-dom	.125[b]	.132[b]	.089[a]	.097[b]
Developing strong relationships with others on the job	F-dom	-.008	-.012	-.017	-.025
Obtaining recognition outside of work	M-dom	.074	.076[a]	.050	.051

[a] $.05<p<.10$; [b] $.01<p<.05$; [c] $.001<p<.01$

Table 5
Partial Correlations of sex dominance
with composite indices of success values holding
age and education constant

Variable	Expected Correlation	Zero Order	Controlling Age	Controlling Education	Controlling Age & Education
		(n=298)	(n=297)	(n=297)	(n=296)
Composite MVALUE2	M-dom	.240[c]	.253[c]	.198[c]	.213[c]
Composite FVALUE2	F-dom	.030	.039	.041	.061
Composite RVALUE2	F-dom	-.090[a]	-.102[b]	-.092[a]	-.114[b]

[a] .05<p<.10; [b] .01<p<.05; [c] .001<p<.01

Six of the 12 variables tested were indicated as definitions chosen significantly more often than others: "being well liked," "becoming an authority," "achieving a very high salary," "obtaining a job title indicating responsibility," "obtaining recognition from others on the job," and "achieving awards outside of work" (Table 6).

Attitudes Toward Work

Few differences were indicated among the three groups of women with respect to their feelings about work and careers. Findings indicated women in male-dominated jobs are the most likely to feel they have experienced problems resulting from sex discrimination and to feel pressure from others on the job. On the other hand, results suggested women in female-dominated jobs feel their work is more important than do women in the other two groups (Table 7).

Findings did not substantiate the stereotypes suggested in the literature about "female jobs" vs. "non-traditional jobs" where a general portrayed of traditional jobs for women is that they are dull, boring, repetitious, underpaid, and undervalued by organizations. These attitudes were not demonstrated in this study. Women in female-domonated jobs did not feel discrimination exists in their jobs nor did they indicate disatisfaction with their career progress.

Likewise, despite better pay and more promotions over a shorter period of time, women in male-dominated jobs were not found to be more committed to working in general, more committed to their

Table 6
Success Values in Rank Order and
Percentage of Women Indicating Value as Very Important

Independent Variable	M-dom %	M-dom Rank	R-bal %	R-bal Rank	F-dom %	F-dom Rank
Recognition from work	68.0%	1	49.2%	2	41.3%	3
Becoming an authority	65.8%	2	54.1%	1	46.7%	2
Acquiring a very high salary	39.3%	3	31.6%	4	23.8%	7
Being well-liked	38.5%	4	40.9%	3	46.2%	1
Contributing to the welfare of others	33.5%	5	34.4%	5	36.4%	4
Having a title indicating responsibility	34.2%	6	20.0%	7	21.2%	8
Recognition outside of work	26.4%	7	24.6%	6	23.8%	6
Developing strong relationships with others at work	30.0%	8	22.9%	8	28.8%	5
Acquiring a large home or expensive piece of real estate	8.3%	9	3.3%	9	4.9%	10
Marrying someone who has money	6.5%	10	3.2%	11.5	6.7%	11
Supervising volunteer projects	8.4%	11	4.9%	12	7.7%	9
Obtaining Awards outside of work	6.4%	12	4.9%	11.5	5.7%	12

Ranked according to median value: Kendall Coefficient of Concordance ($W = .9304$, $p<.01$)

Table 7

Tests of Hypothesis 3

Variable[1]	M-dom	R-bal	F-dom	Chi square	V	Significance
To what extent						
Work importance % very great	27.9%	27.4%	43.4%	7.860	.156	.01<p<.05
Satisfaction with accomplishment % great, very great	42.2%	45.2%	50.0%	1.539	.069	N.S.
Commitment to working at current job % great, very great	51.6%	54.8%	51.4%	.218	.026	N.S.
Worry about job % moderate or more	50.3%	46.8%	40.4%	2.465	.088	N.S.
Composite (TALLCOM)[2]	53.6%	58.1%	59.2%	.891	.053	N.S.

[1] df = 2; [2] df = 2

current jobs, more career-oriented as teenagers, more likely to feel control over their future careers, more on target with career goals, more likely to choose the same job over again, nor more satisfied with accomplishments. This research indicated women in female-dominated jobs are just as likely to be satisfied with their accomplishments as are women in the higher prestige, higher paying, male-dominated jobs.

DISCUSSION

Findings supported only one of the three hypotheses. Significant differences were found between the groups of women tested in their emphasis on instrumental task factors of success. Women in male dominated jobs indicated a higher need to define success as "recognition from others on the job," "becoming an authority," "achieving a high salary, " and "obtaining a title of responsibility." No significant differences were found between the groups with respect to "fear of success" imagery or importance to socio-expressive factors of success.

Fear of Success

Findings suggest that women in female-dominated jobs are aware of promotional opportunities becoming available to them in male-dominated jobs. None in this job category indicated the cue figure (a woman) of the story would have problems or reason to be apprehensive about work in a technical area. On the other hand, over a third of the women in male-dominated jobs felt the opposite. They indicated the cue figure would have difficulty. This may be

because women in male-dominated jobs could better identify with the story situation.

When the cue figure of the story is promoted to a managerial position with secretaries in her charge, women in all three groups expressed the same proportion of "fear-of-success" imagery. This position apparently is no more anxiety-arousing for one group than the others, possibly because management of a group of secretaries is a role all can identify with. Importantly, the research does not substantiate Horner's (1968, 1970) rationale that because women in female-dominated jobs are inhibited by "fear-of-success", they do not seek entrance into male-dominated jobs.

Definition of Success.

Successful achievement of high salary and a titled position of responsibility are both more possible in the male-dominated job market where opportunities are opening to women. Female-dominated jobs, however, continue to be undervalued in terms of both pay and status. Women with skills qualifying them for male-dominated perceive themselves more valuable to the organization and therefore demand greater opportunity to share in decisionmaking and responsibility. Desired compensation, linked with the job position, makes women in male-dominated more likely to identify with instrumental-task factors of success.

Socioexpressive factors of success (e.g., "contributing to the welfare of others" and "developing strong relationships on the job") were expected to be more important to women in female dominated jobs as a compensation for the undervaluation of these positions.

But what about women in female-dominated jobs with college degrees? Those with lesser education in this category are more satisfied with their accomplishments than are college graduates in male-dominated fields. If education is the motivator, in time, women in female-dominated work who have one or more degrees could ultimately set higher sights for themselves. This can be predicted when the proportion of women rises substantially in male-dominated areas. Both the social and organization structure will be affected by general social acceptance of changing roles, decreased discrimination in pay and promotion for women in the traditionally male fields, and greater overall awareness of greater flexibility of cultural norms.

New insights about the meaning of success were gained through this study. They are, however, merely indicators. Continuing research is necessary to support and expand these results. Findings of further study will impact the current design of research tools and the validity of their application in currently assumed relationships. Of equal value will be insights gained in terms of motivating men and women in the achievement of their successful careers, personal potential, and contributions to the organization.

Notes

1. For this research, jobs with 30% or fewer women were identified as male-dominated; jobs with 70 - 100% women were classified as female-dominated; and jobs with 30 to 70% were labelled as relatively balanced.
2. Operational definitions provided the companies defined a job "ideally categorized as male- or female-dominated if 85% or more of the job holders over the past few years had been systematically only one sex." However, because this criterion could not always be reached, a ratio as low as 70% was also acceptable.

REFERENCES

Almquist, E.M., & Angrist, S.S. Career salience and atypicality of occupational choice among college women. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1970, 32(2), 82-90.

Almquist, E.M. Sex stereotypes in occupational choice: the case for college women. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1974, 5, 13-21.

Aronson, S.G. Marriage with a successful women: A personal viewpoint. In R.B. Kundsin, (Ed.), Women & success: the anatomy of achievement. New York: William Morrow, 1974.

Bardwick, J.M. Readings on the psychology of women. New York: Harper & Row, 1972.

Bartol, K.M. Male and female leaders in small work groups. Michigan State University; MSU Business Studies, 1973.

Centers, R., & Bugental, D. Intrinsic and extrinsic job motivations among different segments of the working population. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1966, 50(3), 193-197.

Clark, P. & Esposito, V. A study of occupational advice for women in magazines. Journalism Quarterly, 1966, 43(3), 477-485.

Ginzberg, E. & Associates. Life styles of educated women. New York: Columbia University Press, 1966.

Horner, M. Sex differences in achievement motivation and performance in competitive and non-competitive situations. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1968.

Horner, M. Femininity and successful achievement: A basic inconsistency. In J. Barwick, E.M. Douvan, M.S. Horner, & D. Gutman (Eds.), Feminine personality and conflict. Belmont, California: Brooks-Cole, 1970.

Horner, M.S. Toward an understanding of achievement-related conflicts in women. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28(2), 157-175.

Komarovsky, M. Cultural contradictions and sex roles. American Journal of Sociology, 1946, 52, 184-189.

Komarovsky, M. Functional analysis of sex roles. American Sociological Review. 1950, 15, 508-516.

Larwood, L. and Wood, M.M. Women in management. Lexington, Massachusettes: Lexington Books, 1977.

Lozoff, M.M. Fathers and autonomy in women. In R.B. Kundsin, (Eds.), Women & success: the anatomy of achievement. New York: William Morrow, 1974.

Mizruchi, E.H. Success and opportunity: a study of anomie. New York: The Free Press of Glenco, 1964.

NCOIWY, American women today & tomorrow. (National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977.

Nehbrass, R. An empirical investigation of "plateared" managers. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Southern California. 1975.

Parsons, T., & Bales, R.F. Family, socialization and interaction process. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1955.

Rand, L. Masculinity or femininity? Differentiating career-oriented and homemaking-oriented college freshman women. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15(5), 444-450.

Rossi, A.S. Barriers to the career choice of engineering, medicine, and science among American women. In J.M. Barwick (Ed.) Readings on the psychology of women. New York: Harper & Row, 1972.

Shaver, P. Questions concerning fear of success and its conceptual relatives. Sex Roles, 1976, 2(3), 305-320.

Simpson, F. Women and bureaucracy in the semi-professions. In A. Etzioni (Ed.), The Semi-professions and their organization. New York: The Free Press, 1969.

Spence, J.T. The thematic apperception test and attitudes toward achievement in women: a new look at the motive to avoid success and a new method of measurement. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology. 1974, 42(3), 427-437.

Tresemer, D. Research on Fear of Success: Full Annotated Bibliography, MS 1237. Abstracted in the Journal Supplement Abstract Service of the American Psychological Association, Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 1976, 6(1), 38.

Tresemer, D.W. Fear of success. New York: Plenum Press, 1977.

Turner, R. The social context of ambition: a study of high school seniors in Los Angeles. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing, 1964.

Wood, M.M. What does it take for a woman to make it in management? Personnel Journal, 1975, 54, 38-41.

Wood, M.M., & Greenfeld, S.T. Women managers and fear of success: a study in the field. Sex Roles, 1976, 2(4), 375-387.

Wood, M.M., & Greenfeld, S.T. Fear-of-success in high-achieving male and female managers. To be presented, American Psychological Association, National Convention, Toronto, August 28-September 1, 1978.